

Mr. GROSS. Professional problem. One anecdote which explains the dilemma which you will find insolvable in a problem such as this.

A television show, or radio show, that had invited me, also wanted a professional psychologist to come on. I called a gentleman at a university in New York who had expressed antagonism against personality testing and invited him to appear. He said, "I will think about it." I called him back and he said "No." I asked "Why?" He said he agreed that the tests that are now in use are no good. But, he added, "I am working on one." You are faced with the tremendous problem of an infant discipline, in which many of the people within the profession will say, in general terms, that the tests are inaccurate, unscientific, et cetera.

However, they invariably add, we are doing unusual work on tests at this school. You face a very grave problem in which the individual and personal claims, and personal allegiances to schools of psychology will confuse you.

As an example, Dr. Hans Eysenck, a very important psychologist who is director of the Institute of Psychology at the University of London, has written extensively on the fallacy of the Rorschach blot test, Draw-A-Man Test, and all other projective instruments. Dr. Eysenck would, I think, support verbatim and even more vociferously than I, the objections to projective tests.

However, Dr. Eysenck is one of the world's great authorities in a positive sense, on the question and answer tests. He thinks that the only possibility for psychological personality test truth is in questions and answers, and he has been working on that for many years.

Another expert, Burleigh Gardner of Social Research, Inc., of Chicago and the people at Personnel Labs in New York will say that question and answer tests are ridiculous. It is obvious to them that question and answer personality tests are fallacious and make no psychological sense. You can cheat on them. They only have face validity. They will repeat what Cronbach and Eisenberg and others say about the problems involved.

But, they say, the thematic apperception test and the Rorschach ink blots and other projective instruments that they give—often "blind," as in the case of the Personnel Labs in New York—are exceptionally good because they make clinical sense.

Do you see my point? It is very simple for the journalist to put the two together and say that it is obvious to the objective viewer that both arguments are sound. I can say there is no test validity anywhere because each gentleman is exposing each of the pieces of the puzzle for me separately. I just put them all together. You cannot do this in a valid discipline. You can't conclusively prove little pieces of failure in science. You can't prove a mathematical equation or a chemical equation is wrong, and therefore that chemistry or mathematics is false.

I would say that if you wanted a more moderate attack, more moderate cynicism, you might get Prof. Anne Anastasi at Fordham University, Prof. John Dollard of Yale, Prof. Lee Cronbach of the University of Illinois.

But, as I say, you have problems. Dollard is not commercially involved in testing in any way. Dr. Anastasi is not commercially involved but she just did a personality test for the College Entrance Examination Board for college students and has developed a biographical scale she thinks is good.